

## REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of December 31, 2007, claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,714,032 B1 (hereinafter “Reynick”). In addition, claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Reynick in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,109,558 B2 (hereinafter “Nakano et al.”)

In response, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1 and 11 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference of Reynick. Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Reynick, as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of pending claims 1-12.

### A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1 and 11

The amended independent claim 1 recites “*applying a plurality of different DC power supply voltages to a circuit or component under test*” and “*measuring the quiescent current of said circuit or component after application of each of said power supply voltages to generate a current signature representative of the operation of said circuit or component,*” which are not disclosed in the cited reference of Reynick. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Reynick.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Office Action on page 4 asserts that the cited reference of Reynick “teaches that a plurality of vectors (i.e., voltages) are applied to the DUT (see col. 4,

lines 54-67; col. 10, lines 2-10; and col. 9, lines 50-60).” However, the vectors (i.e., voltages) described in Reynick are not “*DC power supply voltages*,” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the cited reference of Reynick does not disclose “*applying a plurality of different DC power supply voltages to a circuit or component under test*,” as recited in the amended independent claim 1.

The conclusion that the vectors described in Reynick are not equivalent to the claimed “*DC power supply voltages*” is further supported by the fact that Reynick in column 13, lines 42-45, describes applying “a voltage stress equivalent to approximately two and one-half times the nominal power supply voltage ( $V_{dd}$ ) for a duration of approximately 100 ms.” As shown in Fig. 3 and described in column 13, lines 49-58, the voltage stress is administered after the set of voltage vectors is applied. The fact that a voltage stress involving power supply voltage is administered after the voltage vectors are applied indicates that the voltage vectors are not power supply voltages. Consequently, the vectors described in Reynick cannot be equated to “*DC power supply voltages*,” as recited in the amended independent claim 1.

Furthermore, the cited reference of Reynick describes administering a single voltage stress involving power supply voltage. Consequently, the cited reference of Reynick also does not disclose “*measuring the quiescent current of said circuit or component after application of each of said power supply voltages to generate a current signature representative of the operation of said circuit or component*,” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Since the cited reference of Reynick does not disclose each claimed element, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Reynick. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claim 11, which recites similar limitations as those of the amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claim 11 is also not anticipated by the cited reference of Reynick, and request that this amended independent claim be allowed as well.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-10 and 12

Each of the dependent claims 2-10 and 12 depends on the amended independent claim 1. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of the amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the amended independent claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Pineda De Gyvez et al.

Date: February 29, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/  
Thomas H. Ham  
Registration No. 43,654  
Telephone: (925) 249-1300